arXiv:quant-ph/0211119v1 19 Nov 2002

# Response to Comments by Myrvold and Appleby

Karl Hess[1] and Walter Philipp[2]

[1] Beckman Institute, Department of Electrical Engineering and Department of Physics,University of Illinois, Urbana, Il 61801
[2] Beckman Institute, Department of Statistics and Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois,Urbana, Il 61801

**Abstract**

Myrvold and Appleby claim that our model for EPR experiments is non-local and that previous proofs of the Bell theorem go through even if our setting and time dependent instrument parameters are included. We show that their claims are false.

We first review briefly the parameter space introduced by Bell [1] and our extension of this parameter space. Then we discuss the claims of Myrvold [2] and Appleby [3]. We use the notation of our previous papers [4], [5]-[7].

Bell's parameter random variables are essentially given by the functions $A_{\mathbf{a}}(\lambda) = \pm 1, B_{\mathbf{b}}(\lambda) = \pm 1$ that indicate the spin value, with $\lambda$ being a source parameter. It is generally assumed that the way EPR- experiments are performed guarantees that $\lambda$ is independent of the instrument settings $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$.

We add in our model [4]-[7] setting and time dependent instrument parameter random variables $\lambda^*_{\mathbf{a},t}$ operating at station $S_1$ and $\lambda^{**}_{\mathbf{b},t}$ at station $S_2$.

These variables $\lambda^*_{\mathbf{a},t}$, $\lambda^{**}_{\mathbf{b},t}$ can be thought of as being generated by two computers with equal internal computer clock time but otherwise entirely independent. The "values" that these variables assume could be represented by any programs that evaluate the input of $\mathbf{a}, t$ etc. We do not claim knowledge of any mathematical properties of these parameters as dictated by physics nor do we claim that they must exist in nature. We can currently not simulate the EPR experiment on such independent but time correlated computers and never have claimed that we can. However, we postulate that any proof of Bell-type inequalities that is relevant to locality questions must pass the test to include setting and time dependent instrument parameters. These instrument parameters do obey Einstein locality and, therefore, must be covered by any EPR model that is constructed like Bell's. We have shown, however, in references [4]-[7] that the standard proofs of Bell-type inequalities [1] do not pass this crucial test.

The reason for the difficulties of Bell-type proofs with such parameters is that two time correlated computers can produce virtually arbitrary setting and time dependent joint probability distributions for Einstein local parameters $\lambda^*_{\mathbf{a},t}$ and $\lambda^{**}_{\mathbf{b},t}$ such as:

$$\rho_s(\lambda^*_{\mathbf{a},t}, \lambda^{**}_{\mathbf{b},t}, \lambda, m) \tag{1}$$

where $m$ corresponds to a concatenation of very short time intervals that can be effected in various ways [8]. The subscript $s$ of $\rho$ indicates the setting dependence.

Bell and all his followers exclude such parameters since they assume that their probability distribution $\rho(\lambda)$ does not depend on any setting. The instrument parameters that they do include are conditionally independent given $\lambda$. In other words, if instrument parameters are included, then all Bell-type proofs (see e.g. p 36 of [1]) assume a product distribution:

$$\rho_s(\lambda^*_{\mathbf{a},t}, \lambda^{**}_{\mathbf{b},t}, m|\lambda) = \rho_1(\lambda^*_{\mathbf{a},t}, m|\lambda) \cdot \rho_2(\lambda^{**}_{\mathbf{b},t}, m|\lambda) \tag{2}$$

Because we consider time correlations of the parameters, this cannot be true. Thus Bell and followers exclude a large set of joint probability densities. This was overlooked by Myrvold [2] who falsely claimed that Bell-type proofs do go forward with time and setting dependent instrument parameters. We have already previously [9] written in more general terms about other claims of Myrvold and turn now to the claims of Appleby [3].

Appleby claims that the functions $A_{\mathbf{a}}, B_{\mathbf{b}}$ of our model violate parameter independence. Because we have $A_{\mathbf{a}} = \pm 1$ and $B_{\mathbf{b}} = \pm 1$, parameter independence is equivalent to:

$$E\{A_{\mathbf{a}}|\lambda\} = E\{B_{\mathbf{b}}|\lambda\} = 0 \tag{3}$$

where $E\{.|\lambda\}$ denotes the conditional expectation value with respect to $\lambda$. Appleby claims that the corresponding conditional expectation values of our work do not obey Eq.(3) and are setting dependent (see Eqs.(6)-(12) of [3]). However, we have already shown in section 5.3 of [4] that our model fulfills Eq.(3) by an obvious addition or extension namely the introduction of a Rademacher function or any Lebesgue measurable function $r(t)$ that assumes the values $\pm 1$ on a set of measure 1/2 each. We state in [4]:

"To fulfill requirements of physics, it is necessary to be able to obtain certain values $-1 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ for measurements on one side only and therefore one needs to be able to have predetermined values for the following type of integrals

$$\int A\rho du dv = \alpha \tag{4}$$

It is easily seen that this can be achieved without changing the result for the pair correlation by use of functions $A, B$ generalized in the following way."

$$A_r := A_{\mathbf{a}}(u) r(z) \tag{5}$$

where $r(z)$ can be any Lebesgue measurable function that assumes only values $\pm 1$, and a similar equation for $B$. Then we wrote: "The important special case $\alpha = 0$ is particularly easy to achieve in a multitude of ways. For example one can choose a function $r(t)$ (depending only on time t) that varies rapidly and symmetrically between $\pm 1$."

Appleby [3] did not follow our recipe to use $r(t)$. He uses $r(\lambda)$ instead and obtains a useless result. Had he used $r(t)$, it would have been obvious that one obtains Eq.(3) in our [4] model. If, on the other hand, one deliberately makes the choice where $r = r(\lambda)$, then it is equally obvious that Eq.(3) may not hold as Appleby has shown in great detail [3].

For lack of space, we did not repeat our argumentation concerning the Rademacher function in reference [6] as we were confident that any reader would be able to apply Fubini's theorem on double integration to the present context; in particular, when the integral of Eq.(4) is a product of two terms where one of them $\int r(t)dt = 0$.

The same effect can be achieved in a simpler way. Instead of introducing a new dimension, represented by the coordinate $t$, we partition, in our original construction, each layer with label $m$, where $m = 1, 2, ..., N$, into two parts say $(m, m')$ with $m, m' = 1, 2, ..., N$. On the part with label $m$ everything remains the same. On the part labelled $m'$ the density $\rho_{(m')} = \rho_{(m)}$, remains the same, but $A_{\mathbf{a}}$ is replaced by $-A_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $B_{\mathbf{b}}$ is replaced by $-B_{\mathbf{b}}$. Then for each pair $(m, m')$

$$A_{\mathbf{a}}^{(m')} + A_{\mathbf{b}}^{(m)} = 0 \tag{6}$$

The expectation values of the $AB$ products remain unchanged. Therefore, Appleby's claim of parameter dependence in our model is invalid.

We are currently preparing a new and expanded version of our construction that is hopefully clearer and somewhat simplified while at the same time addressing all concerns so far published by several authors.

# References


[1] J.S. Bell, "Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics", Cambridge University Press (1993)

[2] W. C. Myrvold, quant-ph/0205032, May 7 (2002)

[3] D. M. Appleby, quant-ph/0210145, Oct. 21 (2002)

[4] K. Hess and W. Philipp, quant-ph/0103028, March 7 (2001)

[5] K. Hess and W. Philipp, Proc. of the Nat. Academy of Sci. (USA), Vol. 98, 14224-14227, (2001)

[6] K. Hess and W. Philipp, Proc. of the Nat. Academy of Sci. (USA), Vol. 98, 1427-14234 (2001)

[7] K. Hess and W. Philipp, Europhys. Lett. Vol. 57, 775-781 (2002)


[8] The arguments put forward in this paper do not depend on any particular construction of $m$. However, we can use as an example the following. Imagine the time axis wrapped around a circle of circumference corresponding to the time-period that needs to be allocated for a single measurement and normalized to one. We suppose that for large fixed $N$ each interval $[(m-1)/N, m/N], m = 1, 2, ..., N$ gets about its proper share of time measurement points over the time of the whole experiment. This construction induces a random variable $R$ which assumes values $m = 1, 2, ..., N$ with equal probability. The label $m$ also corresponds to the label that we previously have used in connection with the time and setting dependent operators $O_{\mathbf{a},t}$ etc.

[9] K. Hess and W. Philipp, quant-ph/0209057, Sept. 10 (2002)